

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application, for indicating that the drawings filed July 16, 2003 are accepted, and for acknowledging the Information Disclosure Statements filed on July 22, 2004 and January 7, 2005.

Specification Amendments

Paragraphs [0001]-[0003] of the specification are amended to insert the correct serial numbers of the U.S. patent applications referenced in these paragraphs. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter is added by way of these amendments, as the amendments are merely formalities to provide the correct serial numbers of referenced U.S. patent applications.

Amendments to the Drawings

Applicants hereby submit a replacement sheet for Figure 2. The changes made to the aforementioned figure include adjusting the font, aligning connectors, and replacing handwritten reference numbers. Applicants assert that no new subject matter is added by way of these amendments. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge the replacement sheet as acceptable in the next action.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application. Claims 9 and 17 are canceled by this reply without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 21 and 22 are added by way of this response. Claims

1, 21, and 22 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 21, and 22.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 is amended to clarify the scope of the invention. Claims 2-4 are amended to correct typographical errors and antecedent basis issues arising from the amendment of independent claim 1. Claims 10-16 are amended to depend from new independent claim 21 and to correct antecedent basis issues arising from the aforementioned amendment. Claims 18-20 are amended to depend from new independent claim 22 and to correct antecedent basis issues arising from the aforementioned amendment. No new matter is added by way of any of the above amendments, as support may be found, for example, in Figures 6, 8-9 and paragraphs [0033]-[0035] and [0044]-[0046] of the specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 7-13, and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0054810 (hereinafter “Chen”). Claims 9 and 17 are canceled by this reply, thus this rejection is now moot with respect to claims 9 and 17. Claims 8-13, 15, 16, and 18-20 no longer depend on a rejected base claim. Thus, the rejection is now moot with respect to claims 8-13, 15, 16, and 18-20. To the extent that the rejection may still apply to the remaining claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

“A claim is anticipated only if *each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP § 2131 (emphasis

added). Further, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.” *Id.* Applicants respectfully assert that Chen fails to disclose at least the following limitations of amended independent claim 1:

receiving a request from said portal user to access a resource from said resource server via one of a plurality of services on said portal server;
performing, by said portal server, a sign-on to access said resource server wherein said sign-on to access said resource server is performed by a single sign-on adapter, wherein said single sign-on adaptor is configured to provide an interface between said plurality of services and said resource server;
receiving access to said resource from said resource server; and providing access to said resource to said portal user via said portal server, wherein each of the plurality of services are executing on said portal server.

The Examiner asserts that Chen discloses “said portal server performing a sign-on to access said resource server.” Office Action dated March 8, 2007 at page 3. In reaching this conclusion, the Examiner found the portal server and resource server analogous to the iMobile gateway of Chen. See Office Action dated March 8, 2007 at page 2. However, Chen teaches that mobile device users “communicate with one of the [iMobile] gateways before accessing a respective one of a plurality of iMobile servers *via a message queue.*” Chen at paragraph [0113] (emphasis added). Specifically, the iMobile gateways, “place each *service request* on the *message queue*,” where an iMobile server (not the iMobile gateway) subsequently picks up the service request and interfaces with the appropriate resource server. Chen at paragraphs [0113]-[0114] (emphasis added). Clearly, the iMobile gateway does not provide user access to resource servers *via one of a plurality of services on said portal server.* Rather, the access to the resource server is performed by a separate iMobile server.

Moreover, Chen discloses that iMobile gateways (portal servers) use an AAA service to provide “authentication, authorization and accounting to the gateways and servers.” Chen at paragraph [0114]; Fig. 17 at 518. Therefore, Chen does not teach performing, *by said portal server*, a sign-on to access said resource server. Rather, the performance of the sign-on access is performed by a service separate from the iMobile gateway.

Finally, Chen is silent with respect to the iMobile gateway performing a sign-on to access the resource server by a single sign-on adaptor, where the single sign-on adaptor is configured to provide an interface between the *plurality of services and the resource server* when the plurality of services *are executing on said portal server* (iMobile gateway). As discussed above, the iMobile gateway is not connected to any resource server. Further, the iMobile gateway does not include multiple services or a single sign-on adaptor configured to provide an interface between the multiple services and the resource server. Rather, the iMobile gateway is connected to an iMobile server, which in turn is connected to the resource server. Thus, the iMobile gateway functionality is limited to interaction with the iMobile server, without any interaction with the resource server.

In view of the above, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over Chen for at least the reasons given above. Claims 2-5 depend directly from claim 1 and are therefore patentable over Chen for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen. Claim 14 no longer depends on a rejected base claim, thus the rejection is now moot with respect to

claim 14. To the extent that the rejection may still apply to claim 6, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, “the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest *all the claim limitations*.” MPEP § 2143 (emphasis added). The Applicants assert that the reference fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 6.

As discussed above, Chen does not expressly or inherently describe each and every element of amended independent claim 1. Claim 6 depends directly on claim 1, and is patentable over Chen for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

New independent claims 21 and 22 are added by way of this reply. No new subject matter is added by the new claims as support for the new claims may be found, for example, in Figures 6, 8-9 and paragraphs [0033]-[0035] and [0044]-[0046] of the specification.

New independent claims 21 and 22 include limitations substantially similar to those of independent claim 1, and are patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons. Dependent claims, which depend from claims 21 or 22, are also patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as new independent claims 21 and 22. Accordingly, favorable consideration of the new claims is requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/510001; SUN030083).

Dated: July 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/
Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments (Replacement Sheet - Figure 2)